

A N

1608/415

ANSVVER

T O

Dr. STILLINGFLEET'S

Mischief of Separation,

BEING

A LETTER

Written out of the

COUNTREY

T O

A PERSON of QUALITY in the

CITY.

Who took Offence at the late SERMON of Dr. Stillingfleet, Dean of S. Pauls; Before the LORD MAYOR.

The Second Edition.

LONDON, Printed by S.W. and sold by S. Tydmarsh, at the Sign of the Kings Head in Cornhill, near the Royal Exchange: 1680.





A
LETTER

Written out of the COUNTRY

TO A

Person of Quality in the CITY,

&c.



Perceive your Mind is disturb'd, which my
Friendship with you can no more let me be
unconcern'd for, than if I heard you were
sick; nor less to study your Relief. Such
may be the *Cause* and *Measure* of your Pas-
sion, and such the *disproportion* between the
One and the Other; as to need it a great deal more, though
yet perhaps to deserve it less. For your sickness might be
your infelicity only, but a perturbation that exceeds its
Cause, cannot but be your fault. Which kind of Evil,

A 2

though

though it be much greater, and therefore needs more application for the removing of it; yet it can challenge less help from another, because you are your own Afflicter, and may, when you please cure your self, which no man else can do for you.

But if another may contribute towards it, by laying before you apt Considerations which you are your self to apply, you know you are to expect it from no mans good will more than mine. If indeed you expect much from my Ability, that is another Fault, entirely your own, and where you could have no temptation.

Thus much I shall freely profess to you that I have a great value of an equal temper and composure of mind, not apt to be unduly mov'd, or entertain any thing that occurs with indecent perturbation, or other resentment than is due and suitable to the occasion: And desire it more than either to be in the best external circumstances, or not to be in the worst. As I wish for my self, I wish for you; and therefore am willing to place my endeavour accordingly, where it may be in a possibility of effecting somewhat to your advantage, and where it is most desirable it should.

In the present case, the Fault I find with you is, that your resentment of the matter you complain of; is *undue*, and *not proportionable to the occasion*. And whereas you seem to labour under the Distemper and excess of a two-fold Passion, of *Fear*, lest a just and good Cause (as you and I do both account) should suffer some great prejudice, by this opposition of Dr. *Stillingsfleet*: And of *Anger*, that he from whom better things might have been expected, should attempt any thing in this kind. I shall hereupon endeavour to represent to you the causelessness both of your *Fear*, and (in great part) of your *Anger*.

And first defend the Cause against Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, and then

then add somewhat in defence of Dr. *Stillingsfleet* against you.

I. As to the former we are

I. To give the plain state of it, with the Doctors Judgment against us in it.

II. To discuss the Matter with the Doctor, and shew;

1. The Indefensibleness of that Judgment.

2. The Inefficacy of the Doctor's Attempt to Defend it.

I. It is first necessary that we have a true state of the cause it self before our Eyes; which is plainly this,

That as there are very great numbers of People, beyond what the Ministers of Parishes, in divers places, can possibly perform Ministerial Duty unto: So there are withal very many that cannot be satisfied in conscience, to intrust their Souls and their Spiritual Concernments to the Pastoral Care and Conduct of the Parochial Ministry only; Though they generally have a very reverend esteem of *divers* who are of it: do, many of them, very frequently partake of some part of their Labours, and rejoyce in *them* as great Ornaments and real Blessings to the Christian Church. But *these* are very unproportionable in number to the Necessities of the People, and are by *Legal* restraints ty'd up *one way*, as *they* by *conscientious*, are *another*, in respect of some principal parts of Christian Worship;

Worship; without which they should be visibly in the condition of *Pagans*.

There are also many persons who have been devoted to the Service of God and his Church in the Ministerial Function; some of them in the way which now obtains, others in a way which this Reverend Author did not disapprove, who are not satisfied in Conscience about the Terms upon which they might have continued, or may be admitted Parochial Incumbents.

So that here are numerous Flocks scattered without Pastors, here are many Pastors without Flocks.

The People it is true, on whose behalf these Papers are more especially written, are in this destitute condition by their own scruples. Nor is it the present design to justify all those scruples. But they are, with many, of long continuance, and, for ought appears, unremoveable. If they should be defer'd, and bidden to use patience, while such further endeavours are used with them as this Sermon contains, yet death will have no Patience, nor be defer'd. So that there are multitudes passing into eternity out of a Christian Nation, having no benefit of Christian Ordinances; no means of instruction in the Truth and Doctrines of the Christian Religion, in order to their Salvation.

The course which is *de facto* taken in this distress for their relief is that which the reverend Author bends himself against in this Sermon. And there are two sorts of Persons concern'd in it. *The People*; who, rather than return to the state of *Paganism*, implore the help of these unemploy'd Ministers, desiring them to perform the duty of Christian Ministers towards them. And *the Ministers*, who rather than *they* should cease to be Christians, or *themselves* always cease from the Work of Ministers, comply with their desires; and, as they can, allow them their desired help.

This

This Author doth more directly and professedly speak to the case of the People ; To that of the Ministers, only by way of Oblique reflection.

You and I, who (among the *former*) do often partake in the Worship and Ordinances of God, in the separate Assemblies (though we are not so squeamish as to balk the Publick, nor so unjust and ungrateful, as not to thank God for the excellent advantages that are sometimes to be met with there) are both concern'd, and led by the Doctors discourse, to consider what is said as to this case of ours. Which yet I would have us consider not so appropriately, as to exclude *them* our very compassionate consideration, that are more pincht and confin'd to narrower limits, by their own scruples, than we are ; and whose Number you cannot but apprehend to be so great, as to call for a very large compassion in considering their case.

It is indeed a case of far-prospect, and which looks down upon after-times. You know how easily it may be deduced all along from the beginning of the *English* Reformation, when some very eminent among our Reformers were not well satisfi'd with the Ceremonial part of the Constitution settled at that time ; How an unsatisfi'd party hath gradually increased from Age to Age among the Common People also. They are now grown very numerous. And unless some very over-powring impression upon mens minds, (not reasonably to be expected according to common measures) should alter the case, it is still likely to increase in succeeding Ages.

You are not ignorant that no one thing is more commonly scrupled by this unsatisfi'd Party, than the addition of that federal Rite in the dedicating of their Children to God, *the signing them with the sign of the Cross*, which many (how justly or unjustly I am not now to discuss) esteem so sinful a practice, that, rather than admit it, they will choose
not

not to offer their Children to Baptism. Nor is it *in it self* of less weight (perhaps 'tis of much greater) that, *in this solemn dedication*, they have no opportunity of performing the *Parental Duty*, of Covenanting with God on behalf of their own Children, but *that part* (with the exclusion of *themselves*) is to be done *by others*, whom God hath not concern'd in the business; and who, after the solemnity is over, are never like to concern themselves. And there are divers other scruples besides, in reference to *this*, and *other* parts of Worship that, with multitudes, are in no great probability to admit of cure.

Now let us see what the Reverend Doctors judgement is upon this state of our case, who dissent from the established way, whether *the People*, or *their Ministers*, and that both *concerning what they do*, and *what*, by consequence from his judgment upon their case, *they are to suffer*.

For the *Practice* of the People in this case (at least the negative part of it) he hath some Charity in his Censure, for in their declining to joyn in the Publick Assemblies, he beleives *them* generally to practice according to their judgement as he professes *P. 37.* of his Sermon. For the Ministers, most of them, none at all, who as he saies in the same Place he believes go against theirs. His Words are, 'I dare say, if most of the Preachers [at this day in the *separate meetings* were soberly asked their judgements, whether it were lawful for the People to joyn with us in the Publick Assemblies, they would not deny it; and yet the People that frequent them, generally judge otherwise. For it is not to be supposed, that faction among them should so commonly prevail beyond interest.

But his judgement concerning what both are to undergo is *eventually*. and *in the sequel*, as he states their case, much more hard in respect of the People, who cannot relieve themselves; whereas the Ministers, according to the notion he hath of them, presently may.

We

We are to attend chiefly to what he says in reference to the Lay-people, and shall consider, 1. How severe he is towards them; and 2. How well consistent he is therein with himself.

1. His severity towards those of us *in respect of what we practice*, who put ourselves under the pastoral care of other than the *Parochial* Ministers is to be seen in what he proposes to himself to evince, P. 20. viz. *That our proceeding to the forming of separate Congregations, i. e. under other Teachers, and by other Rules, than what the established Religion allows, is the present case of separation which he intends to consider, and to make the sinfulness and mischief of it appear.* He doth you see in short, absolutely pronounce our practice in this case to be *sinful and mischievous*.

Now it is hence also to be collected, how hard things he would have us *suffer* upon supposition of our only remaining unsatisfi'd to joyn ourselves into the *Parochial* Communion. He doth not indeed bespeak for us *Gibbets, Whipping-posts, or Dungeons.* Nor (directly) any thing grievous to our *Flesh.* But to such as consider themselves to have souls made for an everlasting state, the doom which his words imply, in the mentioned place, cannot be thought gentle. Which that you may apprehend the more distinctly; observe that he hath nothing to say against our *bare suspending Communion in some particular Rites which we modestly scruple, while we use it in what we judge lawful, p. 20.* (whereas p. 37. he supposing us generally to judge it unlawful to joyn in the *Publick Assemblies*) to which purpose he also speaks in his *late Dialogues* p. 171. and 172. (giving his Antagonist an account of what he had said in his *Irenicum* to the matter now in discourse) viz. *That some scrupulous and conscientious men, after all endeavours used to satisfy themselves, may remain unsatisfied as to the lawfulness of some imposed Rites, but dare not proceed to positive separation*

from the Church, but are willing to comply in all other things save in those Rites which they still scruple: and concerning these he puts the Question, whether such bare Non-conformity do involve such men in the Guilt of Schism. And this he confesses he resolved negatively (approving or not disavowing that resolution.) Thus far indeed he well agrees with himself; and seems to have no Quarrel with us.

But consider the fatal consequence. He well knows that if we suspend Communion in the Rite of the Cross (upon our never so modest scruple) we cannot have our Children Ministerially dedicated to God in the Ordinance of Baptism, nor be so ourselves, if, being adult, we remain any of us unabptized (as he may well apprehend many among us are) nor if we decline the use of *Sponsors* as to what we conceive should be performed by Parents for their Children, and by adult persons for themselves. And that if we kneel not before the consecrated Elements at the Lords Table, we are not to partake of his Holy Supper. Yes, and what if we scruple somewhat that is more than ritual, to sit under the Ministry of a noted drunkard, or open Enemy to godliness as our Teacher and Guide, when we might enjoy the fruitful labours of one that hath not *his qualifications* every Lords day? No, by no means, without limitation, or the supposition of any possible case wherein it may be otherwise, a meeting never so little besides the established course, he will *make appear is sinful and mischievous*, and not tolerable upon any terms.

What then would he have us do? He directs us indeed after ward to the endeavour of satisfaction. But what shall we do if after our utmost endeavours our dissatisfaction remain? What, while we are endeavouring? which may be all our days in vain. What if we can never be satisfied concerning the established way of Baptism for ourselves and our Children, and of partaking the Body and Blood of

our

our Lord and Saviour ? Nor to hear or give Countenance to such a ones pretending to Preach the glorious Gospel of the Blessed God, who either substantially perverts and depraves it, or whose profligate life proclaims him an opposer and enemy to the Holy Rules and defin of it? Nor to commit our selves to the pastoral care and charge of a less exceptionable person, yea though otherwise never so deserving, that hath ty'd his own hands, and is under such restraints that he cannot, or so disinclin'd that he will not dispense the Ordinances of Christ in such a way, as wherein with satisfaction to our Consciences we may enjoy them.

Read over the Doctors Sermon again, and again, and you will find no course is prescribed us, but to sit still without any enjoyment of Christian Ordinances at all. And with how great numbers must this be the case? for himself professes to believe, that the People that frequent the separate meetings (who you know are not a few) *do generally* judge it to be unlawful to joyn in the Publick Assemblies. And are we alwaies to sit still thus? That is to exchange Visible Christianity for Visible (at least negative) *Paganism*!

This, if you take the whole compass of it, is a thing of awful importance, that so great a Limb of a Christian Nation, they and their posterity, should be Paganized from Age to Age, and cut off from the whole Body of the Christian Community, only because they scruple some things, the least exceptionable whereof are no part of the Christian Institution (as himself, and they whose Advocate he is, will freely confess) nor do necessarily belong to it, being (as they contend) but *indifferent* things.

He *seems* rather contented we should not be Christians at all, than not to be Christians of this particular mode. That we should rather want the substance of Christs Gospel and Sacraments, than have them accompany'd with confessedly needless additions, and which we fear to be forbidden us by their Lord and ours.

We do sincerely profess wherein we decline the Communion he invites us to, we only displease him, and those of his way and mind, out of a real fear of otherwise displeasing God. We agree with them in far greater things than we can differ in. We are of that *One Body* which they themselves profess to be of, so far as *meer Christianity* is the distinction, and collective bond of it, and desire to be under the conduct and Government of that *One Spirit*. We are called with them in that *One Hope* of our calling, and earnestly expect (whatever hard thoughts they have of us) to meet many a one of them in the participation of the blessed hoped end of that calling. We acknowledge that *One Lord*, that *One Faith*, that *One Baptism*, (or Covenant which the Baptism of our Lords appointment seals) and that *One God* and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all. Yet because we cannot, we dare not consent with them to the additions which belong not (and which we fear are unduly affixt) to the Religion of Christians, we are adjudged to be (as much as in them is) cut off from Christ, deprived of the dear pledges of his love, and acquisitions of his Blood, *are driven out from the inheritance of the Lord*, and it is in effect said to us *go and serve other Gods*. Thus far the severity of this reverend Author towards us extends. Which while we thus truly represent and recount, let us also.

2. Consider what agreement it holds with what we elsewhere observe from him. We have already taken notice, that for our bare non-conformity he acquits us of the guilt of *Schism*. And p. 20. of this Sermon, he says, 'He doth not confound bare suspending Communion in some particular Rites, which persons do modestly scruple, and using it in what they judge to be lawful, with either total, or at least ordinary forbearance of Communion in what they judge to be lawful; and proceeding to the forming of separate

parate Congregations, &c. 'Tis this latter he severs and singles out for his opposition. Against our *suspending Communion in some particular Rites* (which we judge unlawful) *if we use it in what we judge lawful*, (which I with him, presume the Lay-Dissenters in England generally do;) he hath nothing to say: Yea, and undertaking to shew *what Error of Conscience doth excuse a man from sin, in following the Dictates of it*; he tells us p. 44. That *if the Error be wholly involuntary, i.e. If it be caused by invincible ignorance*, (which he thus explains in the following words) *or after using the best means for due information of his Conscience; though the act may be a fault in it self, yet it shall not be imputed to him for a sin, because it wanted the consent of the Mind, by which the Will is determined.*

And now, Sir, I beseech you consider, 1. When he confesses if we be willing to be satisfied, and our Errour be involuntary, it shall not be imputed to us for a sin; Why are we to be so severely dealt with for what is not to be imputed to us for a sin? If it were any, methinks it should not deserve such *rigor* at the hands of *Men*, that are themselves also liable to Mistakes and Errors. Is it so very criminal, if every poor illiterate Dissenter in England (Man or Woman) cannot in all their days attain to a better and more settled Judgment in such dubious matters, than this Reverend Person had himself arriv'd to twenty years ago? Especially that never had, or were capable of having those peculiar helps and inducements, to temper and reform their judgments that he hath enjoy'd. 'Tis a long time that his own judgment hath been ripening to that maturity, as, at length to think it fit and seasonable to say so much as he hath, for the reforming of ours, even in this Sermon. Methinks he should not be so very quick and hard towards us, upon so tender a cause, as our scrupling *some particular Rites* to adjudge us and ours to be totally

totally deprived of *Baptism*, which themselves count necessary to our salvation, and of the other Ordinances of Christ, which they do not think unnecessary.

And consider secondly, Whereas he says, *That if a man erre after using the best means for due information of his Conscience, — it shall not be imputed to him as a sin.* What if we erre this Error (as he counts it) after using the best means for due information; [that we ought rather than to return to the state of *Paganism*, to bear our part in the forming of such Meetings for the Worship of God, as wherein we may, with the satisfaction of our own Consciences, enjoy all his holy Ordinances.] It will surely be within the compass of this his general Position, and not be imputable as a sin. Then it is to be hoped we should rather choose to do so, then Paganize our selves, or live in the wilful neglect of his Institutions: Which to do by our own choice, when we might do otherwise, we cannot but think a very great sin.

It here the Doctor should assume to himself to tell us not only that we erre herein (whereof we are to regard his proof, as it shall be considered by and by, more than his Affirmation:) But also that our Error is wilful, we shall appeal from him to one that better knows, how willingly, how gladly we should receive information, and admit the belief, that we ought to content our selves entirely and only with such provisions as the established Religion, (to use the *Doctors* phrase) allows us, if the evidence of the thing it self did not seem irresistibly and unavoidably to perswade us otherwise. And for him to say so, were but to suppose men wilful, only for not being of his mind, who can as easily think him so, for not being of theirs.

But this cannot be a Question between the Doctor and us; whom, as we have taken notice above, he hath so far

far obliged, as to admit p. 37. That *we generally judge as we practice, and that it is not to be supposed that faction among us should so commonly prevail beyond interest.*

But since this appears to be his determination concerning us, and that his Assertion seems positive and peremptory, p. 20. [That in this our case, *to proceed to the forming of Congregations under other Teachers, and by other Rules than what the establish'd Religion allows, where a sinful and mischievous separation.*]

We are in the next place,

2ly, To discuss the Matter with the Doctor; wherein we shall endeavour to shew,

1. The indefensibleness of the Judgment the Doctor hath given in this case; which will both infer (and in some part excuse) what we are afterwards to discover:

Viz.

2ly, The Infirmary of what is alledged by him in this Attempt of his to defend it.

1. For the former, it being obvious to common observation, that a natural self-indulgence and aptness to decline and wave what is of more terrible import to themselves, doth usually insinuate and influence mens minds in their judging of such Cases: We are the more concern'd (because a favourable false judgment will do us no good) with an impartial strictness to hold our selves *to the thing it self.* And when we most strictly do so, methinks the Doctor should have somewhat an hard Province of it. For his Determination amounts to thus much, [That we ought to be kept in a state of Damnation for scrupling the Ceremonies] (*i. e.* to be deprived of the necessary means of our salvation.) And *that*, while he accounts our scruple (after the use of due means for our information) not imputable to us as a sin: And not *that* only, but that we ought to consent to our own damnation.

tion for this no sin of ours. Inasmuch as it would be sinful and mischievous to procure to our selves the necessary means of our salvation in another way, while we apprehend that, without our sin, we cannot have them in the way which he allows us.

We are indeed satisfied, that our sin one way or other would contribute little to our salvation: But when also we are satisfied that we cannot enjoy the means of salvation in his way without sin; and *he tells us*, we cannot without sin enjoy them in our own: We hope every Door is not shut up against us, and cannot think the merciful and holy God hath so stated our case, as to reduce us to a necessity of sinning to get out of a state of damnation. And therefore this Reverend Author having already determined that our Remedy cannot lie (as our Consciences are hitherto inform'd) in coming over to him and his way; For he believes we generally judge it unlawful to joyn with them in the publick Assemblies, *p. 37.* and says, *p. 43.* *That no man that hath any Conscience will speak against the power of it, and he that will speak against it, hath no reason to be regarded in what he says:* (as no question he expected to be, otherwise he had not given himself so much trouble) and concludes, *p. 44.* *That we should sin in going against it.* As he also thinks we should in acting with it, which (as is necessarily imply'd) we as yet see not: Our great hope upon the whole matter is, that our relief must lye in taking the way which we do take; And that it cannot be proved to be sinful.

We reckon it is not, and that the Doctors judgment herein is simply indefensible, because whatsoever is sinful must transgress some Law immediately divine, or that obliges by vertue of the divine Law. And we cannot find that God hath made any Law, or enabled any made by others, to oblige us *so far*, in our present Circumstances, as that we should

should be involv'd in the guilt of sin, by some variation from the letter of it. For any Divine Law that can be supposed to oblige us to the use of the things we scruple, or else to live without the Worship and Ordinances of God, not knowing any such our selves, we must wait till we be inform'd of it.

And that his Law doth give an obliging force *so far* to any other, we as yet understand not. Wheresoever he hath been pleased to lodge and entrust the Keys of the Church, we do not find he hath appointed them to that use, to admit us into the Communion of his Worship and Ordinances, or totally to exclude us, upon such terms. And herein we suppose we have the Doctor consenting with us. Who in his *Irenicum*, p. 216. plainly asserts, *That the Office which the power of Keys implies is Ministerial, and not Authoritative; Declarative, and not Juridical.* And says in the Preface to the same Book, *That He that came to take away the unsupportable Yoke of the Jewish Ceremonies, did never intend to gall the Disciples Necks with another instead of it.* Whereto he immediately adds in the same Preface. *And it would be strange the Church should require more than Christ himself did; and make other conditions of her Communion, than our Saviour did of Discipleship.* What possible reason can be assign'd or given why such things should not be sufficient for Communion with a Church, which are sufficient for eternal Salvation? And certainly those things are sufficient for that, which are laid down by our Lord and Saviour in his Word. What ground can there be why Christians should not stand upon the same terms now, which they did in the time of Christ and his Apostles? Was not Religion sufficiently guarded and fenced in them? Was there ever more true and Cordial reverence in the worship of God? What Charter hath Christ given the Church to bind men up to more than himself hath done, or to exclude those from her society, who may be admitted into Heaven? Will Christ ever thank men at the great day for keep-

ing such out from Communion with his Church; whom he will Vouchsafe not only Crowns of Glory to, but it may be aureole too, if there be any such things there? The Grand Commission the Apostles were sent out with, was only to teach what Christ had Commanded them. Not the least Intimation of any power given them to impose or require any thing beyond what himself had spoken to them, or they were directed to by the Immediate guidance of the Spirit of God. It is not whether the things Commanded and required be lawful or no? It is not whether indifferences may be determined or no? It is not how far Christians are bound to submit to a restraint of their Christian liberty? which I now inquire after, (of those things in the Treatise it self) but whether they do consult for the Churches Peace and Unity who suspend it upon such things? How far either the example of our Saviour or his Apostles doth warrant such rigorous impositions? We never read the Apostles making Laws but of things supposed necessary. When the Counsel of Apostles met at Jerusalem for deciding a Case that disturbed the Churches Peace, we see they would lay no other burden *πάλιν ἢ τὰ ἀναγκαῖα* besides these necessary things. Act. 15. 29. It was not enough with them that the things would be necessary when they had required them, but they looked on an Antecedent necessity either absolute or for the present state, which was the only ground of their imposing those Commands upon the Gentile Christians. There were, after this, great diversities of practice and Varieties of Observations among Christians, but the Holy Ghost never thought those things fit to be made matters of Laws, to which all parties should conform; all that the Apostles required as to these, was mutual forbearance and condescension towards each other in them. The Apostles valued not differences at all, and those things it is evident they accounted such, which whether men did them or not, was not of concernment to Salvation. And what reason is there why men should be so strictly tyed up to such things, which they may do or let alone, and yet be very good Christians still? without all controversie the main In-let of all the distractions.

tractions confusions and divisions of the Christian world, hath been by adding other conditions of Church-communion than Christ hath done.

Nor am I now inquiring whether the things Comman-
ded be lawful or no? Nor whether indifferences may be
determined or no? Nor how far Christians are bound to
submit to a restraint of their Christian Liberty? But only
inquiring (as he there doth) concerning the *Charter given
by Christ* for the binding men up to more than himself hath
done? And I further inquire, *by what power* they can be
bound *which Christ hath not given*: And if there be no such
power to bind them, suppose the things required were all
lawful (which if it can be evinc't, I should rejoyce to see
done) yet while they cannot in conscience think they are,
how can they apprehend themselves bound to be without
the means of Salvation *which Christ's Charter entitles them
to?*

I readily grant it is fit a man do many things for peace
and Common Orders sake which, otherwise, no Law doth
*formally oblige him to i. e. supposing he can do those things with-
out intolerable prejudice to himself.* And so it is commonly de-
termined in the matter of scandals. But can it be thought
a man is to put himself out of the state or way of Salvati-
on in complement to such as will otherwise take offence?
And be so Courteous as to Perish for ever, rather than they
shall be displeased.

Yea, and it may be moreover added, That our course
being accounted lawful, must also (as the Doctor speaks
in another case) be thought a duty: For the things that
are *as means* necessary to our salvation, are also necessary *by
Divine Precept.* We are commanded to hear Gods Word,
to devote our selves and our Children to God in Baptism;
and, *at the Lords own Table*, to remember him, and shew
forth his death till he come. And if we compare toge-

ther certain Positions of this Reverend Author, we cannot see but he must, as our case is, acknowledge our obligation to the practice which he here seems to blame. For in his *Iren.* p. 109. He asserts, *That every Christian is under an obligation to joyn in Church-society with others; because it is his duty to profess himself a Christian, and to own his Religion publicly, and to partake of the Ordinances and Sacraments of the Gospel, which cannot be without society with some Church or other.* And he after adds (on the same page) *It had been a case disputed by some (particularly by Grotius the supposed Author of a little Tract, An semper sit communicandum per symbola? when he design'd the Syncretism with the Church of Rome) whether in a time when Churches are divided, it be a Christians duty to communicate with any of those Parties which divide the Church, and not rather to suspend communion from all of them. A case not hard to be decided; for either the person questioning it doth suppose the Churches divided to remain true Churches, but some to be more pure than other; in which case, by vertue of his general obligation to Communion, he is bound to adhere to that Church which appears most to retain its Evangelical purity. To which purpose he further tells us, page 110. He knows not whether Chrysostom's act were to be commended, who after being made a Deacon in the Church of Antioch by Meletius, upon his death; because Flavianus came in irregularly as Bishop of the Church, would neither communicate with him, nor with Paulinus another Bishop at that time in the City; nor with the Meletians but for three years time withdrew himself from communion with any of them. And p. 113. Where any Church is guilty of Corruptions both in Doctrine and Practice, which it avoweth and professeth, and requireth the owning them as necessary conditions of communion with her, there a non-communication with that Church is necessary, and a total and positive separation is lawful and convenient.* What he discour-

ses.

ses page 111, 112. upon the Question, Whether it is a sin to communicate with Churches *true*, as to *Essentials*, but supposed *corrupt* in the exercise of Discipline? Many of us will no doubt heartily concur with him in. But it touches not the case of *many more*, who do not so much fear upon the account of the neglect of Discipline, to be involv'd in the guilt of other mens sin; as (there seems to be little cause, *that part* being not incumbent upon us :) Nor, if *that* be his meaning, when he speaks of *separating on a pretence of great purity*, is it the case with most of us: but we justly fear (and therefore avoid) to be made to *sin our selves*, by having such things as we judge to be sinful *imposed on us*, as the Conditions of our Communion. And as to this case, this Reverend Author speaks our sense in this last cited Proposition, and pleads our present Cause. Nor need we more to be said on behalf of it than what is reducible to that general Proposition; or particularly, to that second thing (compared with the third) which p. 115. he says makes separation and withdrawment of communion lawful and necessary; viz. *Corruption of practice*, where we say as he doth, *we speak not of practice, as relating to the civil conversation of men, but as it takes in the Agenda of Religion; when unlawful things of that kind, are not only crept into a Church, but are the prescribed devotion of it: Those being required* (which he adds as an accession to the foregoing) *as necessary conditions of communion from all the Members of their Church, which makes our withdrawing from them unavoidably necessary, as long as we judge them to be such corruptions as indeed they are.* And whereas he instances only in such things as belong to the Head of *Idolatrous Customs*, (suppressing what might be instanced under the other Head, which he also there mentions; viz. *superstitious practice*) yet we doubt not if other things also, that appear to be sinful, besides idolatrous Customs,

Customs, be required as necessary conditions of communion, the case will be the same, unless we will distinguish sins, into such as be lawful, and such as be unlawful. Or there be any that may be committed, that we may be admitted to the communion of this or that Church.

Now (to reduce things to the method which suits the present case) if this reverend Author do still judge [that where sinful conditions of Communion are imposed there Non-communication is necessary (and those things be sinful to us which our Consciences judge to be so, as he hath acknowledged.]) And again if he still judge [that we are under an Obligation to joyn in Church-society, so as to own our Religion publickly, and to partake of the Ordinances and Sacraments of the Gospel.] He must certainly account *that* our duty which he taxes in this Sermon as our fault, at least till our Consciences be otherwise informed, whereof many of us have no great hope.

We are indeed not so stupid, as not to apprehend there are Laws, the Letter whereof seems adverse to us Nor are we so ungrateful as not to acknowledge his Majesties clemency in not subjecting us to the utmost rigor of those Laws; whom we cannot without deep regret, *so much as seem* not, in every thing, exactly to obey. Nor can it enter into our minds to imagine that he expects to be obeyed by us, at the expence of our Salvation. Or that it would be at all grateful to him that being, as we are, unsatisfied in some things that are by the Law made necessary to our partaking the priviledges of the Christian Church, we should become Pagans in duty to him. His Majesty was once pleased to give an ample Testimony by his never-to-be-forgotten gracious declaration of *March, 15. 1672.* How remote any such thought was from his Royal Breast, and though we humbly submit to the exigency of those reasons of State from whence it proceeded, that we enjoy not
the

the continued positive favour which his Majesty was then pleased to express towards us; yet we have no reason to doubt, but his propensions are equally benigne as they were.

Nor, though it be uncertain to us what Laws they are, the Authority whereof this reverend person relies upon to make our practice sinful, yet we hope he doth not mean to urge us herein with the Laws of the Civil Government, because those as much forbid our Non-Communion (and under as severe penalty) for which he acquits us from the Guilt of Shilin (or if we endeavour satisfaction) from any sin imputable to us.

But if that should be his meaning, we desire it may be considered how unreasonable it seems, that the design of the Law relating to that part of our practice which the Doctor in this Sermon condemns, being declaredly to prevent sedition; they should take themselves to be meant who are conscious of no such design or disposition.

And again, that it is not with any reason, Charity or Justice to be supposed, that when *that*, and *other*, restrictive Laws were made, either the Temporal ruine of so great a part of the Nation as are now found to be dissenters, was intended by the legislators, or the reducing them to the condition of Heathens. But an uniformity in the Worship of God being, in it self, a thing really desireable; this means was thought fit to be tryed in order to that end. And so are humane Laws, about such mutable matters, generally designed to be probationary; the event and success being unforeknown. Whereupon, after a competent time of Trial, as his Majesty was graciously pleased to declare his own favourable sense and intention, so it is very commonly known that the like propensions were by Common suffrage expressed in Parliament, *viz.* To grant a relaxation. So that the Law, being in its own Nature, nothing
elie,

else but an indication of the Legislators will, we may account the thing was in substance done, so far as may satisfy a mans private reason and conscience concerning the Law-givers intention, and pleasure; though it were not done *with that formality* as uses (and is generally needful) to be stood upon, by them who are the Ministers of the Law. And that it was not done with that formality also, seemed rather to be from a disagreement about the manner, or method of doing it, than about the thing to be done. And how usual is it for Laws, without formal repeal, gently and gradually to expire, grow Old, and vanish away, not being longer useful, as the ritual part of the Mosaical Law did, being come an ineffectual and unprofitable thing? And how easily were it to instance in many other Laws, *the letter of which*, they that urge *these* against the Dissenters, do without scruple transgress? and from which no such weighty reasons do urge to borrow now and then a point? How many dispense with themselves in many parts of their required Conformity, that have obliged themselves to it? *The Priests in the Temple transgress the Law and are blameless.* Yea, and he that knows all things, and who is judge of all knows how little scruple is made of transgressing the Laws by gross immoralities and debaucheries. Men learn to judge of the sacredness of Laws by their own inclinations. Any that can be wire-drawn, and made by torture, to speak against Religion nor modified their way must be most binding. Such as prohibit the vilest and most open wickedness, bind as the Withs did *Sampson*.

The summe of all is, that whereas we are under the Obligation of the Divine Law to Worship God in the use of those his Ordinances which require to be dispensed and attended in society, and that we apprehend we cannot do it without sin in the way which this reverend Author invites us to, Whereas also we do, with this Author, deliberate

rate whether Christ hath given any power to men to oblige us to the things we scruple, or disoblige us from the things we practice and judge it unproved. We cannot but reckon the judgment the Dr. hath given in our case [that our practice is sinful] is erroneous and indefensible by any Man, but least fitly, of most other men, attempted to be defended by himself. From whom it would little have been expected that he should so earnestly recommend that very thing to us as the only Foundation of Union, which he had so publickly told us in his *Preface* to the *Irenicum* 'was, *without Controversie*, the main in-let of all the distractions, confusions, and divisions of the Christian World, 'viz. *the adding other conditions of Church-communion than Christ hath done.*

And though he hath lately told the World there are some passages in that book that shew only the inconsiderateness of Youth, and that he seems to wish unsaid, yet he hath not, that we know, declared that these are some of them. However since this present determination and judgement of his against us is so peremptory and positive as well as severe, let us in the next place,

2. Consider and carefully examine as we are concerned, what he hath performed in defence of it, and it is to be hoped the inefficacy and weakness of his attempt therein will sufficiently appear. What I can find in his Sermon hath any aspect or design that way is either *ad rem* or, *ad hominem*. And to my apprehension his reasonings, of the one kind or the other, are altogether unconcluding.

1. As to what may be supposed to be *ad rem*, if you look narrowly you will find, that the principal things alleged by him, that can, under that notion, give support to his Cause, are only affirmed, but not proved. For instance, p. 9. When he tells us, that the "*Apostle supposed the necessity of one fixed and certain Rule, &c.*". This

had been very material to his purpose ; if, 1. He had told us, and had proved, the Apostle meant some Rule or other super-added to the Sacred Scriptures: For then he might, it is to be presumed, as easily have let us know what that Rule was, which, most probably, would have ended all our controversy; it being little to be doubted we should all, most readily, have agreed to obey it. Or, 2ly, If he had proved, that, because the Apostle had power to make such a Rule, and oblige the Churches to observe it, that therefore such Church-Guides as they whose cause the Doctor pleads, have an equal power to make *other Rules* divers from his, containing many new things, which he never enjoyn'd, and to enforce them upon the Church, (though manifestly tending to its destruction rather than edification.) But these things he doth but *suppose himself*, without colour of proof.

Again, for his Notion of Churches, p. 16, 17, 18, 19. examine; as strictly as you will, what he says about it ; And see whether it come to any thing more than only to represent a *National Church a possible thing* : and whereto the name *Church* may, without absurdity, be given. His own words seem to aim no higher. 'Why *may there not* be one National Church from the consent in the same Articles of Religion, and the same order of Worship ?' pag. 18. 'The word was used in the first Ages of the Christian Church, as it comprehended the Ecclesiastical Governours, and the people of whole Cities. And why many of these Cities being united together under one Civil Government, and the same Rules of Religion, should not *be called one National Church*, I cannot understand, p. 19.

But can it now be infer'd *thence*, that therefore God hath actually constituted every Christian Kingdom or Nation *such a Church* ? Can it further be infer'd, that he hath invested the

the Guides of *this Church*, not chosen by the people (according Scripture, and Primitive practice for some ages) with a power to make Laws and Decrees, prescribing not only things necessary for common order and decency, but new federal Rites, and teaching Signs and Symbols, superadded to the whole Christian Institution; with many more dubious and unnecessary things besides? and to exclude sober and pious Christians, from the Priviledges that are proper to the Christian Church, as such, meerly for that out of conscience towards God, they dare not admit into their Worship those Additions to the Christian Religion? To take order they shall have no Pastors, no Sacraments, no Assemblies for Worship? and because they will not be so much more than Christians, that they shall not be Christians at all?

He that would go about to make these Inferences *meerly from the forementioned ground*, would gain to be laugh't at by all sober men, instead of a *conclusion*? whatsoever better success he should have, who should undertake to prove the same things any other way.

This Reverend Author was so wise as not to attempt either of these: But then in the mean time, what doth the meer *possible notion* of such a Church advantage his Cause? Because it is possible there *might have been* such a *Macedonian*, or such a *Lydian Church*, is such a one therefore necessary? and any other Constitution of a Christian Church *impossible*, or *unlawful*? Or because the General meeting of the Magistrates of the whole City and People together in *Pagan Athens* was called *Εκκλησία*, therefore such must be the constitution of a Christian Church? And therefore *such a Church* hath such powers from Christ as were above mentioned?

Here, howsoever we make our stand, and say that till the Doctor hath proved these two things.

1. That such a Church as he hath given us the notion of, as of a thing meerly possible, is actually a Divine Institution. And
 2ly, That God hath given to the Ecclesiastical Governours in it never chosen by the Christian Community, or to any other Power, to super-add Institutions of the nature above mentioned, and to enforce them under the mentioned Penalties. All his reasonings that pretend to be *ad rem*, are to no purpose, and do nothing at all advantage his Cause.

Yet there are some passages in this part of his Discourse; that though they signifie nothing to his main purpose, are yet very remarkable, and which 'tis fit we should take some notice of.

As when pag. 16. He tells us what he means by *whole Churches*; viz. 'The Churches of such Nations, which, upon the decay of the Roman Empire, resumed their just power of Government to themselves, and upon their owning Christianity, incorporated into one Christian Society, under the same common ties and rules of Order and Government. As if there could be no *whole Churches* in the world that had not been of the *Roman Empire*. Or as if those of the *Roman Empire* could not have been *whole Churches* without resumption of the Civil Government.

Or (as we suppose he means) as if (which he intimates; p. 19.) we needed this (so dearly espoused notion as a ground) to acquit us from the imputation of Schism, in our separating from the Church of *Rome*. Which certainly it were not for the advantage of the Protestant Cause to admit: For then all that remain within the Empire, were bound to continue in the Communion of the *Roman Church*. And in the other Kingdoms, where Princes have not resumed their just right of reforming Errors in Doctrine, and Corruptions in Worship, all should be Schismatics that should separate from the Church of *Rome*.

Again,

Again, when p. 17. He would confute that *great mistake*, the making the *notion* of a Church barely to relate to *Acts of Worship*: (A mistake whereof I never knew any man guilty) He surely runs into as great an opposite mistake, in making the notion of a Church to be *no more* than of a society of men united together, *for their Order and Government*, according to the Rules of the Christian Religion. Now Faith and Worship are, quite excluded the notion of a Church: And Order and Government, and the Rules of the Christian Religion, but *as they refer to these*, only included. Whence it will come to pass, that we can have no notion of *one Catholick Church*, from which yet he argues at the bottom of the *same page*:

Nor, though I dislike the thing; do I understand the strength of the Doctors Argument, against making the notion of the Church barely to relate to Acts of Worship; viz. That if *this held true, the Church must be dissolved as soon as the Congregation is broken up*. For will it not also follow as well, that if the notion of a Church relate only to Order and Government, every time any meeting for Affairs of Order and Government is broken up, the Church is dissolved? And that an Assembly of the States in any Kingdom or Nation cannot break up, without a dissolution of the Government? A Parliament (at least) not Adjourn or be Prorogued without being dissolved? And whereas he adds, *But if they retain the nature of a Church, when they do not meet together for worship, then there is some other Bond that unites them, and whatever that is, it constitutes the Church*. Is it not possible there may be such a Bond for Worship, as well as for Government? an Obligation to meet at stated times for that purpose, when they are not met? And then (if this were all that were to be said to the contrary) why might not *that Bond* as well serve to Constitute the Church?

But:

But secondly, For his reasonings *ad hominem*, they need not detain us long; he argues from the Judgment of the *Assembly of Divines*, and others.

All which arguing must suppose, if it concern us, That we are bound to be of the same Judgment with the Ministers that are and have been so and so minded, which I for my part understand not. But I perceive *here* his intention is, having endeavoured to draw us off from our Ministers; now to move another Stone, and try if he can draw them off from us.

For the Assembly, I think it fit those that survive of them should be as much concluded by what they then determined, as this reverend Author by the *Irenicum*. But I know no reason that such as they never represented, nor who ever pretended to be of their Party, should be so concluded to the Worlds end. Nor do understand why even *the same Party* may not be as well supposed in a possibility to vary from it self in forty years, as the same man from himself in less than twenty. If they did incline to deal too hardly with their Brethren, that will not justify them who deal more hardly. 'Tis hoped such as have been so inclin'd, have, being smitten, and suffered the rebukes of the Almighty, repented it, and are become wiser: And when some think themselves grown wiser by prosperity, others by adversity, there is less reason to suspect the latter.

Yet also this reverend Author ought to have considered the great disparity of the Cases he would parallel. For when *one sort of men* are considering of having only such a frame of things settled, as are imposed by Christ himself, whether they judge rightly or no, that he hath imposed every part of that frame yet while they think and judge that he hath, and consequently that nothing is to be abated of it; 'twere very unjustly argued, that therefore *another sort* professing

feſſing to impoſe many things never impoſed by Chriſt, ſhould abate nothing of their unneceſſary impoſitions.

For ſuch as the Doctor quotes beſides of the Non-conformiſts, acknowledging the Pariſh Churches true Churches, and the lawfulness of holding, ſometimes, Communion with ſome of them. It is not to be thought but among ſo many Parties as come all under one Common Notion of diſſenters from the publick rule (and whom that Rule did not find *one*, but made them ſo *in that Common Notion*) there muſt be great diverſity of Opinions, and proportionably differing practices in theſe matters. I heartily prefer the moſt moderate as I believe you do. But here this reverend Author takes occaſion for ſo ignominious reflections upon our Preachers, as inſincere, diſhoneſt and unconſcientious, as I doubt not in one 20 Years more his ingenuity will oblige him to repent more heartily, than ever it *permitted* him to do of his *Irenicum*. Becauſe he can alledge a very few perſons, that have ſpoken to this purpoſe, therefore firſt it muſt be repreſented to the World as their *common judgement*, next, they are charged with concealing this judgement (*why is this kept up as ſuch a mighty ſecret in the breasts of their Teachers?* p. 37.) and then it is endeavoured to make men think they practice againſt their own judgments in preaching to ſeperate Congregations.

Surely you and I are concern'd, as we have occaſion, to ſay what we truly can, for the juſt vindication of our Miniſters. I doubt not but you believe and you have, *for ſome*, particular reaſon to be confident, it is for our ſakes they expoſe themſelves to the diſpleaſure of ſuch men as D. St.

I muſt for my part ſay, 1. That I beleive it to be the judgement of very few that every Pariſh is, *as ſuch*, a true Chriſtian Church. I am ſorry I have ſuch a ground to fear it of *one kind*, viz. that ſome may not be ſo, as not having among them any tolerable underſtanding of the moſt confeſſedly

cessedly fundamental Principles of Christian Religion. What say you to such where the Minister is grossly ignorant of the Principles of Religion, or habitually vicious, and of a profligate life? Do meer Orders make him a Minister who (perhaps since he received them) is become destitute of the most essential qualifications? any more than the habit, a Monk? or a Beard, a Philosopher? Can a Mercury be made of every Log? Not to insist that this reverend Author can scarce think they are, from a ground of *another kind, because they assemble only for Worship and not for Government.*

2. And surely a Church may be unfit to be Communicated with although it be a true Church; (Those words of the reverend and worthy Dean of *Canterbury* carry their own light with them to this purpose) *As a man*

* Sermon
on *Josb.* 24.
15.

may be truly and really a man, though he have the plague upon him, and for that reason be fit to be avoided by all that wish well to themselves. 'Tis true there are vastly different degrees of that *unfitness*. But I see not how *they* can apprehend there is the *fitness* which is *simply necessary*, who judge there are conditions of Communion imposed that are sinful.

And I beleive this reverend Author will think it possible a true Church may impose some sinful conditions of her Communion, in which case he hath determined a Non-communication with her necessary and unavoidable.

3. For those that are of that judgement, the Parochial Assemblies ought to be Communicated with *so far* as is alledged was declared. As I know none of the dissenting Ministers, that thought they *ought always, and only* to be Communicated with, so I see not with what pretence it can be said they keep up their judgment herein, as a mighty secret. If it be so, how came this Author to have it revealed to him? Is Printing it to the World keeping it secret?

cret? Some have published it *in that way* as we see is known to the Doctor. Others by their frequent discourses, and their own practice. And to my observation divers of them have in their Sermons made it much their business to dispose the minds of their hearers to a truly Catholick, Christian Union, as I have been much pleased to take notice some of the Conforming Clergy do also. But if this be the Doctors quarrel with any of our Ministers (who think such Communion Lawful) that they do not constantly, in every Sermon inculcate the business of Communicating in the Ceremonial way, for my part I shall blame them as much as he, when once he hath made it very evident, that the Ceremonies are more profitable, and likely to do more good to the souls of men than repentance, the faith of the Gospel, the fear of God, a good life in this world, and eternal life in the other, which I confess are the more usual subjects, so far as I have had opportunity to observe, of their preaching.

And let me add, that I can tell you of a secret which some might be apt to think (as it is *really*, so) is *industriously* and much *more unrighteously* kept up in one mans breast, that may be conscious of a great design in it. The Author of the Book intitled the *Weapon Salve*, or *Trenicum*, seems to have found it some inconveniency to him, to have been the Author of so good a Book, whereupon in a certain *Soliloquy* (though he is pleased to represent it as a *tripartite Dialogue*) he asks himself his own opinion of it, and gives himself this answer; *I will tell you freely* (as you know men use great liberty in talking with themselves, though prudence would direct that to be done in some cases, with great Caution, and not to talk inconvenient things too loud, lest they be too much overheard) *I believe there are many things in it, which if D. St. were to write now, he would not have said, for there are some things which shew his Youth and want of due consideration, others in which he yielded too far,*

&c. Now here (though I beleive he had begun to be inclin'd to throw away his *Salve*, and use only the *weapon* for the Wounding of sound parts, not the cutting off the incurable, yet) I conceive one may safely enough take it for granted, his intention was not to retract the whole Book. But whereas he tells us not what he *doth*, (how would the Doctor take it if one should ask) why is this kept up as such ' a mighty secret in his own breast ? Or say the *tenderness of his mind might*, ' tis likely, out of meer *shamefastness* keeps ' him from declaring against what his own Conscience tells ' him is truth. However his retraction cannot make that which was true become false. The *reason of things* is fullen, and will not alter to serve mens conveniences. Perhaps indeed his judgment is really altered. If therefore he would acquit himself like an *honest and conscientious man*, let him tell the world plainly, which be the pernicious principles of that Book, that honest and conscientious men who have thought well of many things in it, (and perhaps the same things which he now disapproves.) may not always be deceived by the shews of Reason that deceived himself, and by which he deceived them. The same justice that obliges not to lay a stumbling block in the way of the blind, doth also oblige him to remove it who hath laid it : Which is to be done not by professing another opinion, for we depend not on his authority, which he hath himself so much diminished, but on the reasons he alledged, which if they were fallacious, let him shew wherein, and answer his own reasons. To say the truth, the gravity and seriousness wherewith that Book was written, appears to have so little of the *youth* in it, in comparison of the jocularity, and sportful humor of some of his latter Writings, when he hath been discussing the most weighty and important Cases of Conscience, that it seems as a Prodigy in Nature, and that he began his life at the wrong end ; that he was old

old in his youth, and reserved his *puerility* to his more grown age. But we hope there is a great residue behind, wherein he may have opportunity and inclination to shew the World, that he did not repent *the pious design* of that Book: Or, at least with a repentance that (can, as well as that) ought to be repented of.

4. And whereas such of the dissenting Ministers, as have most openly declared for communicating at some times with some of the Parochial Churches, have also declared their judgment of the lawfulness and necessity of Preaching and Hearing, and doing other Religious Duties in other Congregations also. If now either the Doctor discern not the consistency of these things, or *they* discern not their inconsistency; is there nothing to be said or thought but that they *acquit not themselves like honest and conscientious men*? Must it be taken for a demonstration of a mans want of honesty and conscience, not be presently of the Doctors Opinion in every thing? or not to see every consequence which he sees, or thinks he sees?

But let us consider the goodness of this Consequence, which it must be so great a piece of dishonesty not to discern. If it be the duty of *some* to communicate *sometimes* with *some* Parish-Churches (for this is the most the Doctor could make of that Relators Concession, whom he cites p. 21, 22. of his Sermon) Therefore it is the duty of every one to communicate with any Parish-Church where his abode is, so constantly and entirely as never to have any communion with any otherwise constituted Congregation.

This is the thing must be to his purpose infer'd; yea and he would have it be from somewhat a lower premise. For he tells us, p. 37. 'That he dare say, if most of the Preachers at this day in the separate Meetings were soberly askt their judgments, whether it were *lawful* (only)

'for the people to joyn with us in the publick Assemblies;
 'they would not deny it. He surely dare not say that
 their meaning was, that it was lawful *constantly* to joyn
 with them in all their *Parochial Assemblies*, unless he dare
 say, what he hath not, from any of them, the least ground
 to think. Now hereupon he collects, p. 38. that our Mi-
 nisters cannot declare so much in a *separate Congregation*, but
this truth must fly in their faces: Because he supposeth it
 repugnant to it, to preach at all in a separate Congrega-
 tion. (and yet afterwards on the same page, he so well a-
 grees with himself, as to bid them, if they would acquit
 themselves like honest and conscientious men, tell the people
 plainly that they look on our Churches as true Churches, and
 that they may lawfully communicate with us in Prayers and Sa-
 craments: And where are they to tell them so, but in the
 separate Congregations? singly and severally he knows it
 were impossible. Nor do I think he would reckon Hone-
 sty and Conscience obliging them to come and tell the peo-
 ple so in their Congregations.)

Now I am afraid there are but a very few honest and
 conscientious men in the World at this day, if none are
 to go for such; but who can perceive the strength and
 reasonableness of the above-mentioned consequence.

And that you may further see what reason our Ministers
 may have, notwithstanding all the alledged Concessions,
 to administer in the Worship of God in our Assemblies;
 though it were never so much their common universal
 judgment, that they and we might sometimes commu-
 nicate in some of the *Parochial*; let us consider, That in
 the more populous and frequented places, as with you at
 London for instance, the Churches cannot receive, some
 not a tenth part, some not half of the people belonging
 to them, few can receive all. Methinks good men should
 not be offended that multitudes do in this distress relieve
 them;

themselves by resorting to other places for necessary instruction. And though it be the inclinations of the people that divide them this way and that (as it can be nothing else) and though places for their resort be not every where most conveniently situate for their resort, where there is most need, (which must be taken not always where it were most desirable, but where they can be had) yet they that have a mind, had better go to places at a more inconvenient distance, than have no whither to go; and it is better the necessities of many should be provided for in such an exigency, than of none. In the mean time, the Churches of worthy conforming Ministers, in such populous places are generally fill'd, as I have been inform'd, and have sometimes had occasion to observe.

Do not necessities of a much lower nature oblige us to recede from stated humane rules? It is well known there is a law against relieving such as beg out of their own Parishes. But if one find upon the road such a poor wretch ready to perish, am I not bound, notwithstanding, if I can, to relieve him? And who would think in such a case I transgress the true intention of the Law?

Yea and Gods own Laws respecting *Rituals, Common Order, and the external part of Religion*, were by his own direction to yield to far less urgent necessities. *To the plucking an Ass or Ox out of a Ditch*, how much more the souls of men? Have we not read what David did when he was an hungred, and they that were with him, how he entred into the House of God, and did eat the shew-bread, which it was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the Priests. How expressly is it alledged by our blessed Saviour, against those nice and punctilious Observers and Urgers of the letter of the Law, the Pharisees, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*. And if he were willing to abate a sacrifice to himself, that there might be room for the exercise of mercy towards

towards *mens bodies*, how monitory and reprehensive should that be to such merciless persons, as would have the *very souls of men themselves be sacrifices to their stiff and unyielding humors* ! Positive Laws cease to bind when, by accident, they thwart the Law of Nature. Which binds to nothing more deeply than the endeavour of saving ones own Soul, and (within the bounds of his calling) his Neighbours as his own.

What if many of our Ministers think it *lawful*, and, at some times, a *duty* to joyn in some of the publick Assemblies ? It is not *then* their duty, when an inviting opportunity, and so urgent necessities lay before them greater duty. This reverend Author tells us, very pertinently to this purpose, when he was declaiming against us and our Ministers. p. 31. of his Sermon : ‘ It is a great fault among some ‘ who pretend to great niceness in some *positive duties*, that ‘ they have so little regard to *comparative duties* : For that ‘ which may be a duty in one case, when it comes to thwart ‘ a greater duty, may be none. This Doctrine we learn ‘ from our blessed Saviour in the case of the obligation of ‘ the Sabbath ; which he makes to yield to duties of mercy. ‘ And can we think that a Duty lying upon us, which, in ‘ our circumstances, makes a far greater Duty impracticable ? We acknowledge Order and Unity very lovely and desirable things, but we think it of greater importance that the Ministers with whom such fault is found conduct men, though not in so accurate Order (which they cannot help) to Heaven, than let them go in the best Order, yea (and as the case is) without any at all, to hell.

And what though *the necessity* of many of us arise from our own Scruples, and what though those scruples were without ground, doth it therefore follow we must be abandoned to perish ? When our very Error if we be willing to admit conviction (as we sincerely are could the
matter

matter admit it) is not imputable to us for a sin? This Author was once pleased to make it one of his proposals for accommodation, p. 64. of his *Irenicum*; 'That no sanctions be made, nor mulcts or penalties be inflicted on such, who only dissent from the use of some things, whose lawfulness they at present scruple, till sufficient time and means be used for their information of the nature and indifferency of the things, that it may be seen whether it be out of wilful contempt, and obstinacy of Spirit, or only weakness of conscience, and dissatisfaction concerning the things themselves, that they disobey. And if it be made evident to be out of contempt, that only such penalties be inflicted as answer to the nature of the offence. *where he adds,* 'I am sure it is contrary to the Primitive practice, and the moderation then used, to suspend and deprive men of their Ministerial function for not conforming in habits, gestures, or the like. Which he makes good by following instances beyond his own present contradiction. It is strange that for *such like* things, *now*, it is thought so highly just, that our Ministers are totally to be kept out of the Ministry, and we out of the Church, and the way of Salvation! are these unproportionable penalties even where contempt appears? and what are they when, through Gods mercy, there appears not the least colour of it?

Is meer scrupling an humane device in the worship of God, and an inability to see with other mens eyes, and to mould and form our judgements and consciences, as some other men can do theirs, a crime so inexpressible, that nothing less than our eternal ruine can satisfy for it? They know, who have read the Turkish History, that *meer scruple* brought that necessity upon the Garrison of Sfetigrade in Scanderbegs daies, that, rather than drink of water which they thought polluted, they must either surrender, or perish. If another possible way could have been found to supply

ply them, was it fit they and the Town should rather be lost, than their unreasonable scruple be born with? Or should they, in that exigency, be still held to it, to drink of that very water or none? We think we have greater reason to urge for our scruples, we think our necessity is greater, the case more important, And God deliver us from such Pastors, as will not think so too, and value souls at an higher Rate.

Our case being thus, we apply ourselves to *Ministers*, bound by their calling and Office to attend the Affairs of the souls of men, they are at leisure, have nothing else to do, they may not live idle and useless in the World. This is their proper business; Whatever their Opinion is about the things we scruple (and we believe it is mostly the same with ours) we see not how they can, or dare, deny us the help of their Ministerial labours, we thank God that they dare not. And should they daily spend their pains upon us to urge us to the Ceremonial way, as we believe they would do it very heartlessly (wishing things to be in that respect, otherwise in the Christian Church, as well as we) so would their labour in that kind be unprofitable, and therefore ungrateful to us. Nor do we think it needs any sort of *mortifiedness* in them (as we find they are jeer'd under that Notion) not to send us away unedified and grieved from their Congregations; so much as a mortifiedness in their love of souls, and their sense of eternal concerns; Wherein too many others, have attained to a great degree of mortification.

But now (my Honored Friend) what think you of our cause? Let us seriously consider it, not according to the appearance which it will have to a Captious Sophistical Wit; But as you will apprehend it to look in the eyes of our supreme and final Judge; considering also the same Blessed Jesus, as that mighty Redeemer and Lover of Souls,
who

who once suffered the just for the unjust to bring them to God. Bring the matter before him, with whom you are to expect no tricks, but most plain and equal dealing. And bethink your self, whether of these two things he will be more likely to have regard unto, *The saving of Souls*, which he bought with his blood ; or, *The preserving inviolate certain humane institutions and rules, confessed by the devisers of them not to be necessary to the being of the Church* which common reason sees unnecessary to its *well being*, to its external order and decency (evidently as great without them) which this Author makes foreign thereto, when he tells us, that *matters of order and decency are allowable and fitting, but Ceremonies properly taken for actions significative, and therefore appointed because significative their lawfulness may with better ground be scrupled*, Iren. p. 68. And which experience shews to be destructive. As whereby so great numbers, not only of his labourers are to be discarded, but of living, flourishing plants to be torn up by the roots, and all thrown out of his vineyard together ?

For my own part I must profess not to have the least doubt concerning the *thing it self* which we and our Ministers do, and practice, it is only our common great concern, to be very careful with *what temper of Spirit*, and *with what design* we do it. It should to the uttermost be endeavoured to be done with all meekness and humility, with all possible reverence to Authority, abhorrence of the least *real contempt*, and unfeigned regret there should be any *appearance* of it, though never so unavoidable; With a design only to glorifie God, and promote the common salvation; Not to make or serve a party, or advance any other interest than that of *meer substantial Christianity and Godliness*. Let us covet this temper of mind, and where we see persons of real worth, and of a true latitude and largeness of Spi-

fit, commensurate to the Christian interest, that fall in with the publick constitution, value and love them nothing the less, than if their judgments about these lesser things were never so exactly squared with our own, and so much more, by how much they may excell us in far greater and more valuable things. And if it be our lot to suffer under the notion of *evil doers* for doing what we take to be *our duty*, let it be according to the Doctors wholesome Counsel with an unrepining patience, and with much thankfulness both to God and our Rulers that we have enjoy'd so much tranquillity; and with that cheerfulness that becomes those that expect a blessed eternity; and to be translated ere long into a pure and peaceful region, where we are to serve God, in society even with many of them who have been offended with us, without scruple or trouble to ourselves or them. If with such dispositions and aims we persist in our course, while our case is attended with such circumstances as now it is; I have no fear, I sincerely profess to you, of our acceptance with God, and, sooner or later, with all good men.

Upon the whole matter, I conceive the honest Cause you were so deeply concerned for, is really unharmed, and I hope you apprehend it too; and that therefore your fear and despondency was causeless, as if it could not outlive this attempt against it by Doctor *St.* As you therefore see how capable it is of defence against him, I shall not forget the other part of my undertaking: but shall

Secondly, Say somewhat (as yours sufficiently lets me see there is Cause) in his just defence against you. And really Sir, though that be an untoward thing to dispute against, I find it needful to defend him only *against your anger*, i. e. *the excess of it*: Which although it can no more harm him, than he hath done the Cause; and consequently the blunting and breaking its edge (which is the

the thing I aim at) cannot advantage him, yet it will do him right ; and (which was the thing I first intended,) will be an advantage and kindness to you.

I must here indeed tell you, that I cannot blame you for being in some measure offended, as I can excuse the Doctor but in part. I do dislike as well as you two things especially in his way of managing this business; *viz.* His *too great acrimony, and too little seriousness.*

For the former it is too evident, and I heartily pity him for it, that he should so forget, and suffer himself to be transported beyond the rules of Christianity and Prudence; neither of which would allow him, (and I am sure within the compass of the former, his Text would not) so to make himself a Standard to all other men, as to suppose no man can be honest or conscientious that is not of his mind in the matters he then undertook to controvert, or that should not judge of the connections of things as he did: I cannot think it hath added to his Reputation to reflect so grossly before such an Assembly, upon a whole Party of Men that are, many of them, well known in the World; and who, in point of Integrity, are so little liable to be suspected, that an attempt to blemish them upon so slight a pretence, and in *matter of fact, so untrue,* could not but recoil upon himself; especially with them that shall impartially compare their Inducements to prevaricate with what he hath.

And for the other, it were indeed to have been wisht, that upon so grave and solemn an Occasion he had forborn *jests,* especially *of that nature;* as for instance, *such mortified and conscientious men, and the most godly — can least endure to be told of their faults, &c.* Which expressions any one that considers his scope, will understand to be Ironical; and that considers the *matter,* to be somewhat bold Ironies; and the *occasion,* to be causeless ones. Inasmuch as it is

not impossible, that truly mortified and conscientious men may desire opportunities to do God Service in the World, in a way that he dislikes. And it may consist with real Godliness, not to count all those things Faults, which he takes to be such. And indeed *in his Dedication*, his way of averting the report of *those ill men*, that he intended to stir up the Magistrates and Judges to a Persecution of the Dissenters, is, to any considering man, sportful and ludicrous; viz. Offering them only such a way of escaping Persecution, as whereupon a man may shun suffering, if he please, from any party of men in the world, *as such*, by being in every thing of their mind and way: But which in effect grants the Charge which he would avoid, that if we will not be so united to his Party, we were to expect nothing but utmost rigor. One would rather have thought he should have bedew'd that Discourse with Tears, which had *in it self*, most manifestly so awful and tremendous a Design: As not only the devoting of so great Numbers, that might possibly not be convinced, and persuaded by him, to a temporal ruine; but the depriving them of the ordinary means of their salvation. And that, if he thought it necessary for the preserving of Order in the Church, they should be so dealt with; he should have spoken of their Case with greatest compassion and tenderness, not with derision and contempt.

Yet I would have you use lenitives with yourself, and calm your own spirit; and I wish you were capable of contributing any thing to the moderating and pacifying his too. That though he have been angry unprovok'd, and with a sort of men, that have ever respected and honoured him as if he had been of themselves; his anger that hath been *without cause* (as you know perhaps who in a like expression blames the exorbitancy of another passion) may not also be *without end*. At least I pray you take heed you do

do not deserve the like sharp repartee, which the *Cynick* met with from *that noble Philosopher*, that he *taxed his pride with greater pride*; that you exceed not the heats whereof you complain. If he will still retain his fervour, let him be angry alone. And his displeasure have its continuance, with as little influence or concomitancy of yours (and I could wish of any other mans) as (for ought I know,) it had its beginning. And *that since he thinks of being a Sacrifice*, he may only burn gently in his own flame, which he may moderate as he please, and I hope will seasonably extinguish, before he have suffered much harm by it.

For the qualifying of *your own too great resentment and Offence*; I would have you consider how great reason you have to believe, that this blow came only from the (somewhat misgovern'd) hand of a pious and good man. Be it far from you to imagine otherwise. If you think he was to blame for intimating suspicions of their sincerity whom he opposes, make not yourself equally blameable, by admitting, hereupon, *any*, concerning *his*. Which would argue a mean narrow spirit, and a most unwarrantable fondness of a party, as if all true Religion and Godliness were bound up in it.

And if it look unlovely in your eyes to see one of much avowed latitude and enlargedness of mind, and capable upon that account of being the more universally serviceable to the Christian Church, forsaking *that comprehensive interest*, so far as to be *ingulfed into a party upon a private and distinct basis*, consider what aspect the same thing would have in yourself. And never make his difference with you in this matter, a reason to yourself of an hard judgment concerning him; who can, you must consider, differ no more from us, than we do from him.

Beleive him, *in the substance* of what he said, to speak according to his *present* judgment. Think how gradually
and

and insensibly mens judgments alter, and are formed by their converse. That *his* circumstances have made it necessary to him to converse most for a long time, with those who are fully of that mind which he here discovers, that his own real worth must have drawn into his acquaintance the best and most valuable of them, and such for whom he might not only have a kindness, but a reverence; and who, therefore, must have the more power and influence upon him, to conform his sentiments to their own.

We ourselves do not know, had we been, by our circumstances, led to associate and converse mostly with men of another judgment, what our own would have been. And they that are wont to discover most confidence of themselves, do usually but discover most ignorance of the *nature of man*; and how little they consider the *power* of external objects and inducements to draw mens minds this way or that. Nor indeed, as to matters of this nature, can any man be confident that the *Grace of God* shall *certainly* incline him to be of this, or another opinion or practice in these matters; because we find those that we have reason to believe have great assistances of divine grace are divided about them, and go not all one way.

We may indeed be confident that had *the same considerations* occur'd to us which have, we should have been of the same mind and judgment that we are. But it is very supposable that some accidental occasions might possibly have happened, that might hinder *our actual taking up such considerations*, though the things to be considered were not unknown to us. And not *that* only, but that might *prevent our knowing*, even matters of Fact, that have signify'd not a little to the determining our judgments that way which they now incline to.

And I do particularly believe (as I doubt not but God is graciously present with those that in the sincerity of their
their

their hearts have chosen to serve him in the way which the Law prescribes so) that if Doctor *st.* had known what Proofs there are of *that same gracious presence*, in these so much censured Meetings, his thoughts would have been very different of them from what they are. I do not speak of proselyting men to a Party, which I heartily despise as a mean and inconsiderable thing: But have known some, and heard of many Instances of very ignorant and profane persons, that have been led, perhaps by their own curiosity, or it may be, by the persuasion of some Neighbour or Friend, to hear and see what was done in such Meetings, that have (through Gods blessing, upon so despised means) become very much reformed men, and (for ought that could be judged) serious and sincere Christians. And whereas some, that have very prejudicial thoughts of all that frequent such Meetings, may be apt to suspect all effects of that kind, to be nothing else but illusions of fancy, or a disposition (at least) to Enthusiasm, or an artificial and industrious hypocrisie; I am very confident that if the Doctor had had the opportunity, frequently to observe and converse with such, as we have had, and heard the sobriety and consistency of their discourse, and seen the unaffected simplicity, humility, and heavenliness of their conversation, he could not have allow'd *himself* the liberty of such hard censures, but would have judged of many such persons as you and I do.

Upon supposition of all which, I make little question but it would have been very remote from him to wish that so many persons had rather lived in sin, and perished forever, than have been brought to repentance and a good life, by being now and then at a *separate Meeting*.

So that for the substance of what he hath said against such Meetings, we have reason to impute it to his judgment; and his judgment to such circumstances, very much, as I have mentioned,

mentioned, that have led him the way he hath taken ; and not given him opportunity to know what might have begot a better opinion in him of the way which he opposes.

But *for the manner* of his treating of this subject, *That* I impute to the prevalency of some present temptation ; and hope he did not express in that Sermon his *habitual temper*. And am highly confident, notwithstanding what he hath said in it ; if it were in his power, we might even safely trust him to prescribe us terms, and should receive no hard ones from him.

Somewhat it is likely he was expected (and might be urged) to say to this business. And his own thoughts, being set a work, fermented into an intemperate heat, which it is to be hoped, will in time evaporate.

If I may freely speak to you my own thoughts, he seems to deal in this business as one that *forced himself* to say somewhat. For though I apprehend he speaks his judgment, yet the expressing it in this time and manner he might regret. And because it might appear a becoming thing to him to seem earnest ; The temptation prevailed with him (against his habitual inclination) to supply with sharpness, the defect of reason ; which the poverty of the Cause afforded not. For really his reasonings are faint, unconcluding, and unlike Doctor *Stillingsfleet*. So that if any *expected* this performance from him, one may think (and this ought in some part to excuse him) that, besides some little flourishes of his reading and wit, he seems only to have lent them his name. Which however I pray you let still be of great value with you. And turn your displeasure into serious earnest praying for him, that his spirit may not be further harm'd ; that, amidst his many temptations, he may be delivered and preserved from being at all puffed up or any way embittered, and that so valuable a person be not lost, or in the least degree, rendered less useful to the Church of

of God. And that all that know his more inward conversation may discern in his frequent savoury discourses, in his continued serious calling upon God in his family, in his readiness to do good, especially to the souls of men, in his aptness to condescend to those that are much beneath him, how great the Efficacy is, of *divine Grace*. And that, through the power of it, a great measure of Wit, learning, applause, and secular advantages, may not only consist with vivid godliness, and sincere devotedness to the Interest of Religion, but contribute abundantly to the service and diffusion thereof in the World. *I am very serious* in this advice to you. Nor, thanks be to God, have so low or profane thoughts of prayer (which hath ever born so great a part in the Religion of all times, nations, and sorts of men) as to think it will signify nothing. Especially when the design of it is not *mean and private*, but such wherein all good men will Unite.

I little doubt but if ever there shall be good days, and an happy state of things on Earth, a factious Zeal for Parties will become a contemptible thing: And all the discriminative Accretions to Religion, which are severally scandalous to all other Parties except their own, who embrace any sort of them (too probably for the sake of some secular interest or other which is hoped to be gratified and engaged thereby) will be spontaneously quitted and abandoned by all Parties from an over-powring sense and grateful relish of substantial Religion it self; i. e. *Entire devotedness to God and the Redeemer, with the joyful expectation of the blessedness of the other World*: And so all become one.

But is this to be done while we sleep and do nothing? Or have we in our Circumstances, any thing to do, by which we may hope to contribute so much towards it *as by Prayer*? By this means (if men of sincere and pious

Minds, did with universal and abstracted Aims, apply themselves to this great Duty) we are to reckon the blessed Spirit of *Holiness, love, and peace*, would be more and more drawn *into consent*. Do you your own part herein, you will find your own present advantage by it: It will fill you with good thoughts, hopes, and expectations. The kindly benign influences whereof, will pleasantly qualifie and temper your Spirit; and make you know how much more grateful an Inhabitant that *Charity* is, which thinketh no evil, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, than frowardness, discontent, vexation, and anger, at any one that thinks and speaks otherwise, than you did expect or wish. Insist upon such things in Prayer, as wherein it may reasonably be expected good men shall generally agree with you. You have the more reason to expect being heard; yea, and ought to hope the *Spirit* of this Person, whom you have taken such offence at, will be rescued out of temptation; and be drawn *into full consent* with you. For you have no cause to doubt, but that he hath those Principles wrought into the temper of his Mind, which need only *resuscitation*, that they may dispose him to union with the whole body of sober and serious Christians of his own way, or of others, (whensoever that can be seasonably endeavoured for) upon more probable and hopeful terms than he hath proposed in this Sermon. *Therefore be you serious and fervent in Requests to this purpose*, as you have that love to God and his Church, which you profess; and that value for this worthy Person which I reckon you still ought to have: or (if that can be fit to be added) any kindness for.

Sir,

Your affectionate Servant, &c.

Since my writing these Pages, I hear of Answers to the Dean's Sermon; which, in so remote a Corner, I have had no opportunity to see: What is here written may therefore (upon comparing) be communicated, or suppressed, as shall be thought fit.

And so I should take leave of you, but that it may be needful, whereas I have principally considered in these Papers, the case of such as think it unlawful to joyn in the publick Assemblies; to add somewhat (whomsoever it may serve) in reference to their case that think otherwise. For to say the truth, this is *here* the more common case: And though the Doctor believes they that frequent the *separate Meetings*, do generally judge it unlawful to joyn in the *Publick*; Howsoever it is with you, (and it is likely the Doctor speaks of what is more within the compass of his own knowledge, or *theirs* who inform him :) It is *with us in this part of this Country* quite contrary. And I may truly say, that *in this place* (and others where I have sometimes occasionally been) the generality of them who come to the other Meetings do also attend the Publick.

Now *these* may perhaps think themselves left under blame. and may apprehend the Doctors Consequence is strong against them, [that if occasional Communion be lawful, constant Communion must be a Duty:] Which he no doubt, understands exclusively of any distinct way of Communion.

And if indeed they judge that Consequence strong, I would fain know what hurt they can think it doth them? Why should any man be afraid of *his duty*? or of *the truth* which makes it known? And, if hereupon, they

can, with the satisfaction of their own Consciences, wave all other opportunities of worshipping God with others of his People, they have the less to do: And why should they complain who are satisfy'd?

But in short, either they apprehend such other additional means, a real necessary help and advantage to them, or they do not. *If they do not*, they have no cause to trouble themselves, nor to grudge that so much is said for others; Whose, for ought I know, may, as the Doctor thinks, (for I cannot make an estimate from this or that little spot) be the much more common case. *If they do*, they have little reason to be concern'd about the Doctors Consequence: Which I much wonder if he himself can think strong. It hath not, you see, been altogether overlook't in the foregoing Discourse: And if any feel themselves wounded by it; He is so great an *Achilles*, that they may have their Wound and Healing from the same Hand.

For, as hath been noted from him in his Preface to the *Irenicum*, he seems plainly to intimate, that *men have no Charter, or Grant of Divine Power*, to make other Conditions of Church-Communion than Christ hath made. If so, then *the Conditions* by which *this way of Communion* is distinguished from the *other*, (supposing they be lawful) are still, *in themselves, matter of liberty, not of duty*: And so 'tis left to the prudence of a Christian to determine him (as in all like cases) this way or that; as will make most for the common good, consistently with that of his own Soul. *That is Sin or Duty*, which in this or that case, will do more hurt or good. There being no *particular* rule to guide a mans practice, he must have recourse to that *general* one: *By which* it may be my duty, upon some great reason, to do that, *at one time*; which for as great reason, I ought not to do in a continued course. And it is highly commend-

commendable, when a Christian understands the latitude which the *Law of Christ* hath left him; Is, in his own Spirit, exempt from servile restraints, by other *imagined* bonds: And can with a generous liberty (pure from base self-respects) turn himself this way or that, as shall make most for the service of the ends he lives for. And when any accordingly use that liberty, 'tis a fancy of none but half-witted persons, to think they must therefore addict themselves to this or that Party.

If a mans case come to be so stated, that he hath reason to apprehend it will do more good than hurt to *others*, that he own a sort of Christians, who have *particularly* modified themselves, otherwise than they needed, by any divine injunction (or by any that God hath empower'd men to put them under) by communicating with them *under the common notion of Christians*, only, not as *so modified*: He doth but express the genuine complexion of a truly Christian Spirit. But he is not to do so *in a continued course*, if he find it will be a real damage to his own soul, in comparison of another way that he finds more edifying. Perhaps if he will be religious only, after the mode of this or that party, his Fare may be either too fine or too coarse for his constant diet. I may, besides my own inclination, drink a single glass of Wine out of Civility to one person, or of Water, to another, when I am not, for any mans pleasure, to destroy my health by tying myself to drink nothing else. And whatever Christian condescendingness, and goodness of temper may prompt a man to, who makes not *what others do*, but *what they ought to do* his rule and measure: They have least reason to expect much compliance from others, who bind themselves up within their own party, are enwrapt as *Leviathan* in his Scales, call themselves *the Church* (as many say here is Christ, and there is Christ) and call all men *Separatists* that will not be of *their Church*. And perhaps they assume,

sume, and appropriate the name with no more pretence or colour, and with no better sense, than if an humorom company of men, should distinguish themselves from others, by wearing a blue or a yellow girdle, *and call themselves mankind!* Do not too many in our daies distinguish their Church and Christian Communion, by things no more belonging to a Church, or to Christianity, than a girdle of this or that colour to humane Nature? And which no more qualify for *Christian Society*, than *that* doth for *human*? If, however, an ingenuous, free spirited man, out of respect to his present company, or for any other valuable reason, should in such a case put on a blue girdle, I shall find no fault with him. But if any should go about to pinch him too close with it, so as would be inconvenient to his ease and health, or oblige him to protest against the *true humanity* of all that neglect it, I doubt not he would throw it away with scorn. Much less would he be a confederate with them that use it, if they professedly combine for the destruction of the rest of mankind that use it not, when many of them that refuse it apprehend it a real grievance. Especially, when they that would impose it, live, with many of the rest, under the Government of a just and sovereign Prince, from whom they have no *Charter* for their imposition, but who hath declared he will not have his subjects so impos'd upon.

In sum, we are all indispensably oblig'd by our Lord Jesus Christ, the sovereign Prince and Ruler of his Church, *to the substance of all Christian Ordinances.* As to *uninstituted modes thereof*, we are free. And they that understand their liberty, may use or not use them as is more for their own, and the common good. They that understand it not, and think themselves under an obligation from Christ not to admit questionable, devised additions into their worship; they are not therefore to deprive themselves of the
sub-

Substantial Ordinances of the Christian Religion, whereof there is no question.

I shut up all with the words of the great Apostle, Rom. 14. 3. 4. *One beleiveth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not, for God hath received him. v. 13. Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block, or an occasion to fall in his brothers way,*

FINIS.

Errata.

PAge 2. l. 4. *after may, r. by dependence on divine help, p. 3. l. 21. r. reverent, p. 6. l. 19. r. Assemblies, p. 7. l. 27. r. supposes, p. 9. l. 2. r. One, l. 5. r. design, p. 13. l. 9. r. were, p. 22. l. 13. r. become, p. 25. l. 1. after according, r. to, p. 26. l. 23. after government, r. these words, as we suppose he means, blot them out in l. 24. p. 29. l. 24. r. separate, p. 33. l. 3. r. inclination, p. 34. l. 18. r. obliged, p. 36. l. 23. r. impracticable.*



L O N D O N :

Printed for SAMUEL WALSALL, at the
Golden Frying-Pan in *Leaden-Hall-Street*, 1680.



